



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Region 5
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, IL 60604-3590

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF:
SR-6J

September 12, 2003

Mr. Douglas Meadors, P.E.
Department of the Army
Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management
600 Army Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310-0600

EPA Region 5 Records Ctr.



374730

SUBJECT: Comments on the *Data Validation Report for the Draft Construction Completion Report on Various Site Remediations at Fort Dearborn U.S. Army Reserve Center, Chicago, Illinois, August 2003*

Dear Mr. Meadors:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 5 (U.S. EPA) has reviewed the *Data Validation Report for the Draft Construction Completion Report on Various Site Remediations at Fort Dearborn U.S. Army Reserve Center, Chicago, Illinois, August 2003* (Data Validation Report). The Data Validation Report was provided to U.S. EPA under separate cover from the *Draft Construction Completion Report on Various Site Remediations at Fort Dearborn U.S. Army Reserve Center, Chicago, Illinois, April 2003*. The Final Quality Assurance Project Plan for Various Site Remediations at Fort Dearborn U.S. Army Reserve Center, Chicago, IL, June 2002 stated that Lee A. Knupple and Associates, Inc., a third-party data validator, would perform a minimum of ten-percent of the laboratory data generated by the project laboratory.

Overall, the document was well written. Please see the enclosed comments for more detail. I have forwarded this comment letter to you electronically to expedite your receipt of it. A signed hard copy will also be mailed to you. If you have any questions, please call me at (312) 886-6150.

Sincerely,

Karen L. Mason-Smith

Karen L. Mason-Smith

Remedial Project Manager

Enclosure

cc: MAJ David Quivey, Army
Colonel Fougner, Director, Army Reserve Division
J. Vranicar, Field & Golan
M. Chrystof, U.S. EPA

R. Suda, MWH Global
D. Graham, City of Chicago
C. Wilinski, Deputy Commissioner
A. Jankowski, IEPA

**U.S. EPA COMMENTS ON DATA VALIDATION REPORT
FOR CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION REPORT
ON VARIOUS SITE REMEDIATIONS, AUGUST 2003
FT. DEARBORN, IL**

COMMENTS:

1. **Section 4.7 Data Review Comments/Surrogate Recovery Limits Sub-Sections:** There is a minor typo in several of these sub-sections, stating that "The total number of samples analyzed was twenty-seventy". Please correct.

Attachment 2 - Checklists:

2. **PCB Checklists:** For all PCB checklists, there is an "N/A" (not applicable) notification for Item 4d (pertains to Retention Time Window specs).. Looking back at the Sample Analysis Subsection for PCBs (see p.25), text notes that the RRT were within control limits. Please explain.
3. **Glycol Checklists:** For the Glycol checklists, there is an "N/A" (not applicable) notification for Item 4d (pertains to Retention Time Window specs).. Looking back at the Sample Analysis Subsection for Glycol (see p.26), text notes that the RRT were within control limits. Please explain.

Attachment 5 - Chain of Custodies:

4. **Cooler Receipt Report/ADRL #301101/Cooler #N011:** Report indicates that there was no Custody Seal date or name, and states "No" to Item 5: "Were custody papers sealed in a plastic bag, and taped inside to the lid?". If this is a typo, please correct. If not, this practice should be revised for future sampling efforts so that the seals are dated and named, and that the C.O.C. form is included in the cooler as required by Item 5.
5. **Cooler Receipt Report/ADRL #301103/Cooler #N004:** Report indicates that there was only one custody seal on the cooler. Aren't two seals normally utilized? Please explain. It would also be helpful if the signature/name on the seal(s) was more legible to the sample custodian, as several sample receipt forms noted that the seal name could not be read.

Attachment 6 - Data Qualifiers:

6. **Semivolatile Tables:** It was noted that the values reported out as "U" were slightly higher than the RL list in the QAPP. There is not an indication in the tables here, but did these samples require an adjustment that thereby raised the reporting limit?



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

Region 5
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, IL 60604-3590

REPLY TO ATTENTION OF:
SR-6J

September 12, 2003

Mr. Douglas Meadors, P.E.
Department of the Army
Assistant Chief of Staff for Installation Management
600 Army Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310-0600

SUBJECT: Comments on the *Data Validation Report for the Draft Construction Completion Report on Various Site Remediations at Fort Dearborn U.S. Army Reserve Center, Chicago, Illinois, August 2003*

Dear Mr. Meadors:

The United States Environmental Protection Agency Region 5 (U.S. EPA) has reviewed the *Data Validation Report for the Draft Construction Completion Report on Various Site Remediations at Fort Dearborn U.S. Army Reserve Center, Chicago, Illinois, August 2003* (Data Validation Report). The Data Validation Report was provided to U.S. EPA under separate cover from the *Draft Construction Completion Report on Various Site Remediations at Fort Dearborn U.S. Army Reserve Center, Chicago, Illinois, April 2003*. The Final Quality Assurance Project Plan for Various Site Remediations at Fort Dearborn U.S. Army Reserve Center, Chicago, IL, June 2002 stated that Lee A. Knupple and Associates, Inc., a third-party data validator, would perform a minimum of ten-percent of the laboratory data generated by the project laboratory.

Overall, the document was well written. Please see the enclosed comments for more detail. I have forwarded this comment letter to you electronically to expedite your receipt of it. A signed hard copy will also be mailed to you. If you have any questions, please call me at (312) 886-6150.

Sincerely,

Karen L. Mason-Smith
Remedial Project Manager

Enclosure

cc: MAJ David Quivey, Army
Colonel Fougner, Director, Army Reserve Division
J. Vranicar, Field & Golan
M. Chrystof, U.S. EPA

R. Suda, MWH Global
D. Graham, City of Chicago
C. Wilinski, Deputy Commissioner
A. Jankowski, IEPA

**U.S. EPA COMMENTS ON DATA VALIDATION REPORT
FOR CONSTRUCTION COMPLETION REPORT
ON VARIOUS SITE REMEDIATIONS, AUGUST 2003
FT. DEARBORN, IL**

COMMENTS:

1. **Section 4.7 Data Review Comments/Surrogate Recovery Limits Sub-Sections:** There is a minor typo in several of these sub-sections, stating that "The total number of samples analyzed was twenty-seventy". Please correct.

Attachment 2 - Checklists:

2. **PCB Checklists:** For all PCB checklists, there is an "N/A" (not applicable) notification for Item 4d (pertains to Retention Time Window specs).. Looking back at the Sample Analysis Subsection for PCBs (see p.25), text notes that the RRT were within control limits. Please explain.
3. **Glycol Checklists:** For the Glycol checklists, there is an "N/A" (not applicable) notification for Item 4d (pertains to Retention Time Window specs).. Looking back at the Sample Analysis Subsection for Glycol (see p.26), text notes that the RRT were within control limits. Please explain.

Attachment 5 - Chain of Custodies:

4. **Cooler Receipt Report/ADRL #301101/Cooler #N011:** Report indicates that there was no Custody Seal date or name, and states "No" to Item 5: "Were custody papers sealed in a plastic bag, and taped inside to the lid?". If this is a typo, please correct. If not, this practice should be revised for future sampling efforts so that the seals are dated and named, and that the C.O.C. form is included in the cooler as required by Item 5.
5. **Cooler Receipt Report/ADRL #301103/Cooler #N004:** Report indicates that there was only one custody seal on the cooler. Aren't two seals normally utilized? Please explain. It would also be helpful if the signature/name on the seal(s) was more legible to the sample custodian, as several sample receipt forms noted that the seal name could not be read.

Attachment 6 - Data Qualifiers:

6. **Semivolatile Tables:** It was noted that the values reported out as "U" were slightly higher than the RL list in the QAPP. There is not an indication in the tables here, but did these samples require an adjustment that thereby raised the reporting limit?